UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/755,418	01/05/2001	Jorge M. Ferreira	60001.0009US01	4805

27488   7590   11/03/2004

MICROSOFT CORPORATION
C/O MERCHANT & GOULD, L.L.C.
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN   55402-0903

EXAMINER
PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/755,418	Applicant(s) FERREIRA ET AL.
	Examiner CESAR B PAULA	Art Unit 2178

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE **3** MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 August 2004* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to the response filed on 8/10/2004.

This action is made Non-Final.

2.   Claims 1-26 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 11, 19, and 21 are independent claims.

3.   The rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grady has

been withdrawn as necessitated by the newly applied rejection.

Drawings

4.   The drawings filed on 1/5/2001 have been approved by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that   form

the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5.   **Claims 1 – 26, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Grady et**

al. hereinafter Grady, Pub.No.: US 2001/0056463 A1 with priority filed on 06/20/02.

Regarding independent claim 1, Grady teaches software for changing or updating personal information, such as email, passwords, etc., in a user account window (0048, 0101). This means that the software gives a user the option of changing or updating the personal information, which has been input by the user. When the email or password information is changed, the old email, and password is replaced -- *removed*--and in its place an new and updated information is input without having to delete the entire document containing the personal information.

Regarding dependent claim 2, Grady discloses registering or saving the updated personal information (0101, 0095).

Regarding dependent claim 3, Grady discloses registering or saving the updated personal information, such as the email address (0101).

Regarding dependent claims 4 and 5, Grady further discloses adding multiple email addresses (0101). In other words the old email address is replaced with several email addresses—replacing specific email information with general or *generic information made up of strings.*

Regarding dependent claim 6, Grady discloses updating personal information, and changing passwords, thereby removing the old information and replacing with the new or updated data (0101).

Regarding dependent claim 7, Grady discloses registering or saving the updated personal information, such as the email address (0101).

Regarding dependent claim 8, Grady discloses using an account window to update the user's personal information (0101). In other words, the same document—*template*-- is used to input the updated information thereby creating a new or second document containing the updated information.

Claim 9 is directed towards a system for implementing the steps found in claim 1, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Claim 10 is directed towards a computer-readable medium having instructions for executing the steps found in claim 1, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Regarding dependent claim 11, Grady teaches software for changing or updating personal information, such as email, passwords, etc., in a user account window (0048, 0101). This means that the software gives a user the option of changing or updating the personal information, which has been input by the user into a displayed document upon login (0089). When the email or password information is changed, the old email, and password is replaced -- *removed*--and in its place an new and updated information is input without having to delete the entire document containing the personal information.

Claims 12-16 are directed towards a method equivalent to the steps found in claims 3-5,

7, and 1 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Claim 17 is directed towards a system for implementing the steps found in claim 11, and

therefore is similarly rejected.

Claims 18-20 is directed towards a computer-readable medium having instructions for

executing the steps found in claims 11, and 1-2 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Regarding dependent claim 21, Grady teaches a software for changing or updating

personal information, such as email, passwords, etc., in an user account window upon login—

receiving input to activate the privacy option (0048, 0089, 0101). This means that the software

gives a user the option of changing or updating the personal information, which has been input

by the user. When the email or password information is changed, the old email, and password is

replaced -- *removed*--and in its place an new and updated information is input without having to

delete the entire document containing the personal information.

Claims 22, and 24 are directed towards a method equivalent to the steps found in claim

2-3 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Regarding dependent claim 23, Grady discloses registering or saving the updated

personal information, such as the email address—*provide a prompt to input instructions or*

personal information to activate the privacy option upon saving or registering the information

(0101).

Claim 25 is directed towards a system for implementing the steps found in claim 21, and

therefore is similarly rejected.

Claims 26 is directed towards a computer-readable medium having instructions for

executing the steps found in claim 21, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant's arguments filed 8/10/2004 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive. The examiner disagrees with applicants statement that the Grady reference is not

concerned with a document-generating application for removing personal information from an

electronic document, and providing a privacy option that enables the removal of personal

information from such document (page 7, lines 11-16). Grady teaches Grady teaches software for

changing or updating personal information, such as email, passwords, etc., in a user account

window (0048, 0101). This means that the software gives a user the option of changing or

updating the personal information, which has been input by the user. When the email or

password information is changed, the old email, and password is replaced -- *removed*--and in its

place an new and updated information is input without having to delete the entire document

containing the personal information.

Applicants indicate that Grady does not disclose a method for removing personal

information from an electronic document produced with an application, short of deleting the

entire document (page 7, lines 20-24). As established above, Grady teaches the updating or

removing of old personal information and placing new or updated information in its place,

thereby allowing the user the option of updating the personal or private information.

Moreover, applicants point out that Grady does not mention a privacy option (page 8,

lines 1-8). As established above in the newly made rejection, Grady teaches the updating or

removing of old personal information and placing new or updated information in its stead,

thereby allowing the user the option of updating the personal or private information.

In addition, applicants note that Grady teaching of changing personal information, does

not anticipate removing one or more pieces of personal information from a first electronic

document produced by a document generating application (page 9, lines 1-13). The examiner

disagrees, because Grady teaches a software or application for the updating or removing of old

personal information from an electronic displayed document generated or created with the

software, and placing new or updated information in its stead (0101), thereby allowing the user

the option of updating the personal or private information.

Regarding claim 4, applicants point out that Grady does not teach the removal of personal

information and replacing with generic information (page 9, lines 16-22). As established above

in the newly made rejection, Grady teaches adding multiple email addresses (0101). In other

words the old email address is replaced with several email addresses—replacing specific email

information with general or *generic information made up of strings.*

Regarding claim 6, applicants point out that Grady does not teach the activation of the

privacy option to remove personal information from the first document (page 10, lines 8-11). As

established above in the newly made rejection, Grady teaches allowing the user the option of

updating or removing the personal or private information from the displayed document.

Regarding claim 11, applicants state that Grady does not teach the activation of the

privacy option (page 10, lines 19-23). As established above in the newly made rejection, Grady

teaches allowing the user the option of updating or removing the personal or private information

from the displayed document.

Claims 13-15 are rejected for at least the reasons expounded above.

Regarding claim 16, applicants point out that Grady does not teach the specified added

steps (page 11, lines 8-9). The applicants are directed towards the new rejection made under

Grady addressing this concern.

Regarding claim 19, Applicants point out that Grady does not teach the activation of the

privacy option to remove personal information from the first document (page 11, lines 10-15).

This claim has been properly rejected as an independent claim in the rejection above. As stated

above in the newly made rejection, Grady teaches allowing the user the option of updating or

removing the personal or private information from the displayed document.

Regarding claim 21, Applicants point out that Grady does not anticipate the steps

specified in this claim (page 11, lines 16-21). The applicants are directed towards the new

rejection made under Grady addressing this limitation.

Regarding claim 7, Applicants point out that the rejection was made over Grady, but

identifies O'Flaherty, and that Grady does not teach this invention (page 12, lines 18-23). The

applicants are directed towards the new corrected rejection made under Grady addressing this

limitation.

The applicants are directed towards the new rejection made under Grady addressing

claims 8, and 15.

Conclusion

I.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is **(571) 272-2148**. The examiner

can normally be reached on Monday through Friday (every other Friday off) from 8:00 a.m. to

4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124. However, in such a case, please allow at least

one business day.

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

> Commissioner for Patents
> P.O. Box 1450
> Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

> Or faxed to:

- **(703) 703-872-9306, (for all** Formal communications intended for entry)

CESAR B PAULA
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2178

11/1/04